

COMMENT

In an effort to improve the process of selecting out unsatisfactory employees CIA has recently extended the probationary period for new employees from one to three years. The Investigative Staff believes this period of probation should be five years to allow a better chance to evaluate the employee in an overseas environment. This would be in accordance with an internal CIA suggestion that case officers be reviewed for retention or separation after five years or upon completion of two overseas tours. Another internal recommendation was that a similar review be made after 20 years service to determine if the officer has senior executive potential or should be retired. (Pages 235-236)

129-130

QUESTIONS

1. What plans does the Agency have to improve the selection out process for unsatisfactory case officers?
2. What consideration has been given the recommendation that case officers performance be reviewed at the end of 5 years or the completion of two overseas tours for consideration of selection out and again at the end of 20 years for forced retirement?
3. Will the Agency continue to assign case officers found to be weak in overseas assignments to headquarters jobs with no further plans for their overseas assignment or utilization?

CM?

DDO
JP

OP

COMMENT

In examining the use of independent contractors in the Operations Directorate the Investigative Staff found that 19 of the [] independent contractors existing at June 30, 1977, (in addition to five others in the process of being converted to contract employees) were being utilized on a full-time basis and appeared to be proper candidates for conversion to contract employee status. It was concluded that although the use of independent contractors is a proper means of hiring persons with unique skills to accomplish specific missions, their use as case officers and in other roles which would normally be filled by employees appears to be a method of avoiding position ceilings. The Agency reviewed the [] cases identified by the Investigative Staff and concluded that [] should have been converted to contract employees (three of these have been terminated and one is scheduled to be terminated in March 1978), one is no longer paid, and [] are continuing as independent contractors, although some of these admittedly are borderline cases. (Pages 255-259)

141-143

QUESTIONS

1. Is not the use of independent contractors in roles normally filled by staff or contract employees a device to avoid position ceilings?
2. What steps is the Agency taking to prevent future employment of independent contractors in roles that should be filled by staff or contract employees?

Cms

DBO
OP

OP